

**Section D. Report of July 15, 2004 Staff Focus Group  
Wisconsin DNR Waste Management Program**

Wausau State Patrol Headquarters

Bert Stitt – facilitator, Susan Puntillo – note taker

Attendance: 30 to 35 people

*Bert's comments in Italics – can contact Bert. Email: bert@bertstiff.com Phone: 255-2363*

**I. Introduction by Deb Pingle:**

- We need to do a redesign and updating of program – internal how we can do things better with the staff. We have to address what we need to cover
- Waste should do what R&R and Air (have done) – we should drive the changes, not have others do it to/for us
- Report to management by end of December with implementation by next fiscal year

**II. Question from group:**

- What have we been hearing from externals? “Good actors (asking)” ‘Are there ways to reduce regulatory oversight?, This is reorganizing the way we do business, not just looking at our structure’
- Is any of this driven by the comment hotline? Deb will follow-up
- If (this is a) preemptive strike because of business, what is public perspective in this?
- Concern that public needs need to be included

**III. Check-in Round:**

No Expectations

- a. No expectations
- b. No expectations

Uncertainty

- a. Not certain of the focus of redesign, not sure what we are supposed to be doing with redesign – might be comparable to water permit streamlining

### Desire to Learn More

- a. Let's just get everyone's input and move on
- b. Good to do this. I am interested in hearing people's take on this.
- c. Hear what co-workers think about what we do and the way we do it,
- d. Opportunity to voice concerns with direction program is going and to hear what others are thinking
- e. Listen a lot, say little – too new to program hopefully learn
- f. Interested in seeing what happens, what direction the dept is going in,
- g. Interested in hearing what people have to say
- h. Expect to get some idea about what the redesign is all about,
- i. Opportunity to hear staff concerns, not just how bad it is , but opportunities for change, learn about business practices and core work that needs to be done
- j. Like idea of getting together without managers around, good to hear different ideas from both new and long term staff, struggle to keep from being too pessimistic with the process, redesign came out of nowhere
- k. It's clear that forces external to the agency are getting stronger. It does not matter what we say. I'm interested to see if people in the regions feel the same.

### Desire for Productivity

- a. Opportunity to voice concerns with direction program is going and to hear what others are thinking
- b. I hope we go beyond streamlining. I equate that to deregulation and talk about physical structure of the program, the hierarchy of the program, wasted expertise.
- c. Optimistic view, problems and challenges in DNR and state are influenced because of national events, look to other countries, to influence other changes we do
- d. My supervisor wanted me to be involved, also I owe it to staff assigned to redesigned team looking for things coming from staff that will shape a better future, come up with something that will be helpful, look at historical context what were issues prior to reorg, did it address, exacerbate, look back at what we have done,
- e. Positive and open communication at staff level
- f. Appreciate getting together – just for the sake of getting together, budget issue, value for getting together and seeing people face-to-face, appreciative for opportunity to give opinion, glad about notes, (hope that the) opinions ... we have will count – fear is they will not count
- g. Critical for the younger people
- h. *Own how you feel, don't apologize*
- i. expect because of the resources we are putting in to this they will listen to what we have to say

- j. hopeful, not sure what is going to happen at the department,
- k. Glad to see that there are a lot of people here, encouraging, hoping input will be heard
- l. Hopeful (that our) comments will have some weight in whatever happens
- m. Hoping for a renewed sense of enthusiasm, excited to hear what others have to say
- n. Excited about the meetings, anticipate there will be follow-up with what comes from this so we get a second kick at the cat, [when coming back from a waste management meeting there was a comment that ... (management) belonged there *with* disgruntled staff. Their not being there showed the lines were drawn. It was (not) ...appropriate (for them not to be there when we are) trying to work together.]

#### Skeptical

- a. certain level of 'do they care what I say'
- b. fear is they (our opinions) will not count
- c. came because it is (my) responsibility, no faith it will be taken into account
- d. Be open, practical, hope pie in the sky does not muddy up doing the job
- e. Apprehensive, not sure what ... (I have to) offer, have many people with many ideas, but not sure it will be recognized by management – open and pessimistic. (*use and rather than but – very significant helps with understanding*)
- f. Like idea of getting together without any managers around, good to hear different ideas from both new and long term staff, struggle to keep from being too pessimistic with the process, redesign came out of nowhere,

#### Sense of Futility

- a. Pessimistic – been through this – just lip service – they will do what they want. Decision has been made
- b. hopeful our message will get across to management, ... (and) pessimistic / experience is they do not listen / just do what they want
- c. does not matter what we have to say this is a done deal
- d. done deal, does not matter what we say
- e. Completely pessimistic, cynical, massive leadership failure in the agency. The reason I am here is for the relationship with other staff. I want to reestablish ties with other staff
- f. It's clear that forces external to the agency are getting stronger. It does not matter what we say. I'm interested to see if people in the regions feel the same.

**IV. Summary of Expectations for the day:**

- a. Like our opinions to count
- b. Pessimism, but presence speaks for itself
- c. Changes have hurt employees and morale
- d. Strong sense of pessimism with kernel of hope

**V. Participant Question:**

Someone needs to explain what we are doing here. What redesign is.

**VI. Response (Deb Pingle?)**

- Streamlining process
- (Looking for ways)... to work more efficiently, provide quicker response to operators we feel can be trusted
- Management memo:
  - resources, streamline, consolidate , adaptable and able to respond quickly to future changes

**VII. Group Response to the Above:**

Lack of Believability

- a. Do not agree with this (above referenced management memo). ... (we are) responding to external pressure – ... (there are) lots of layoffs and not one manager has been laid off
- b. Streamline and redesign is nothing more than euphemism for giving away the farm. However, we do take too long to do things and we should improve that every day.

Lack of Trust

- c. May not be WMT that gets to make the final decision, could be ... (Management)
- d. Put a lot of time and effort into things, but then nothing comes of it

External Pressure

- e. Overall downward pressure on the budget, does not think pressure on what program is doing is from the legislature, pressure is from groups we regulate
- f. External pressure (from industry reps)
- g. if we do not do it the legislature will come down and tell us how long we have to do permits

### Fear

- h.* Fear on part of current management from the regulated community
- i.* Fear may be based on a false expectation on what legislature is going to do

### Citizen Representation

- j.* More need to deal with citizens' concerns

### Integrity of Process

- k.* If there is integrity in the process and the input means something, then it is possible that our redesign parameters can be framed.  
Then we will be better prepared when/if it goes to legislature
- l.* First time I heard of proactive part of redesign, way it was sold was, the EMS, team effectiveness, not serious in changing the structure of the program when hiding behind EMS, etc
- m.* (we have a) History of (doing) things that cost enormous amount of time and money – but what was the environmental impact.  
Concerned redesign will take time and effort, but.. PROCESS IS NOT PROGRESS
- n.* Streamline and redesign is nothing more than euphemism for giving away the farm. However, we do take too long to do things and we should improve that every day.
- o.* We are trying to define redesign – want to make comment on the directives: “Do not whine, do not be pessimistic, do not be resistant to change, get on the train or get off, either you are with us or you are against us.” - Management is following a directive ... – it is not a reorg, it is a redesign .... Does not matter if it is good for the dept. The thing that is a shame or too bad is our careers are dependent on environmental protection. Redesign is basically deregulation to follow wants and desires of commerce and industry and it will be to the detriment of environmental protection. The important thing we should ask for or hope to occur if the redesign proceeds, (is) that input is requested from the environmental segment of customers. If we expect environmental goals to come out of this we should talk to environmental public and not just industry.
- p.* Dept is like a large lumbering elephant – redesign should be evolutionary not revolutionary – does not turn tightly - pendulum swings – we are like fleas on the back of the elephant

### Context

- q. Reasons air and water were redesigned by legislation – because permits took too long. We are different we deal with landfills – we have 4 companies, we are not holding up jobs, - therefore not exactly the same reason
- r. Hotline – complaints are (about) CWD, and deer feeding – not ... (about) landfills
- s. Group can talk about redesign, but want to make sure it is put into a context – political context, where is our leadership? For example - 1200 foot rule – where is headline that ‘new rule will cause bigger landfills – Without context harmful to daily work
- t. Public input 1200’ line – does not see it
- u. Lots of initiatives that are going on that are not necessarily part of this process; green tier, EMS, compacts with companies we regulate, makes me questions what impact this will have. This process sold as one thing, but in the end being used to do something else. When pendulum swings back it will be quite a bit lighter.
- v. This is a regulatory agency – we have mandate and laws to oversee. That is not coming out. By now we should have our way of doing things clearly defined. In question of redesign – what are we supposed to be doing? Laws of program
- w. What are the program priorities; statutory, professional ethical, DNR mission? One of the things we recognize is how we are funded – inherent conflict of interest. We have to keep this in mind – how to exist so that what we do provides the most benefit to the environment.

### Management/Technical Staff

- x. Management of resources: technical people are good. Cannot say that about our managers. The 3:1 staff ratio is foolish, jump on latest bandwagon. Zero waste is an unachievable goal. 1200’ rule goes against this. Eliminate backyard burning – unachievable. ...Management likes change for sake of change
- y. Like management to have a little more assertiveness or backbone – stand up to the pressure – pendulum does swing, but you have to minimize it
- z. Level of professionalism used to be much higher – used to be technical people that became managers – have heard manager say ‘don’t want to be burdened with technical details’. Use it as an insulator. Outside point of view is taken over technical view. Managers no longer contribute to the discipline.
- aa. Managers ... – do not want to make strong statements, do not want to come out in defense of our actions, also do not come out against staff. Bad on both ends. Do things like the redesign to defend themselves. Look like they are doing something when they are

doing just another process. Rather than pessimism ... call it optimistic cynicism – look at way to handle business process to better handle the moment.

**VIII. Dialogue fragments between Facilitator and Participants:**  
(Participant comments in regular type. Facilitator comments in italics.)

- a. *The hierarchical structure has the possibility to be a root cause for success if it is done well.*
- b. Structure is one thing ... (and) ultimately it matters who is in the box or in the structure.
- c. *It also matters if the structure is put together well.*
- d. It is typical of government to look at, or put things in terms of success. Should sometimes look at failures.
- e. *(you might benefit from looking at the) Assumptions of Appreciative Inquiry – see Appendix*
- f. *Staff and managers should be in the room at the same time, managers, Secretary of the dept, all parties should be in the room.*
- g. What good to have everyone in the room if there is no trust?
- h. *(A group such as this does better with)... a facilitator. It does not have to be scary or dangerous,*
- i. (I) have the sense (that we are) digging out of the hole.
- j. *Looks like the top three ... (themes) are Management, Accountability and Environmental protection.*
- k. Is there another step after the email of minutes?
- l. *I (Bert) will take all the info and create a report, will include what he feels is a set of subtexts. Also a confidential report – dealing with any delicate issue if there are any, but so far I have not seen any.*
- m. Staff asked to not have managers in the room because of the direction they got from managers: “accept change, get on the train, with us or against us, etc.” Do not want to be labeled as a malcontent.

- n. *This follows an observation I made when reviewing earlier documents (2001-02) where there were a lot of "shoulds" and "needs" directed from management to teams.*

*Example: "The team 'needs' to etc ..."*

*Saying that the team 'needs' to do whatever is antithetical to concept of having a team and how a team behaves. If you want to enjoin the concept of 'team,' it is important to clarify what you mean by 'team.' In common organizational parlance a team means: the team decides what they will do... they are not told what they must do. There is an assumption that the team is a responsible and productive part of the organization.*

- o. *Feels like the architectural design (of this project) has been built and we are brought in at a later date to pick out the carpet and drapes.*
- p. *May have to have management back up and rethink and maybe try a different path. There is an 'arbitrary' urgency with the Dec. date. Group work does not do well with arbitrary deadlines.*
- q. *Need to involve people up-front and early to include hopes and wishes. You get more of what you want by respecting each other.*
- r. *(I) have a concern with maintaining the public record.*
- s. *Clarification – report will be put out. What is confidential will be things like personnel issues - sexual harassment etc. (I have not come across any thing that fits this category) Bert Stitt*
- t. *[Regarding your (Bert)] Reference to Bureau of Waste Management – is this just the Bureau or does it included the program as a whole? **Should be the Waste Management Program.***
- u. *Separation between working staff and management is troubling. Large concern. Need management to buy-in to listening and acting on staff input.*
- v. *Glad that the term stewardship was brought up. (We) should consider returning to that goal.*
- w. *'Skilled public relations' program. 'Public relations' has at its core the selling you of something you may or may not want. – a better method is public involvement/engagement.*



- x. (In the) Last reorg (we) burned some bridges because we asked everyone (for input) but we did not have the money to do what they wanted so they stopped coming to the table.
- y. *If public/someone is going to be invited to be involved in a process, they also need to be involved in designing ... how they will be involved.*

***Facilitator reflects on” perception is reality:”***

*There was a discussion about the notion that “Perception is Reality in dealing with clients.”*

“Keep to the forefront – perception is always reality when you are dealing with a client” (quote by management person)....

*Following is an instructive listing of items that make up reality contained in The Assumptions of Appreciative Inquiry:*

1. In every society, organization, or group, something works.
- 2. What we focus on becomes our reality.**
- 3. Reality is created in the moment, and there are multiple realities.**
4. The act of asking questions of an organization or group influences the group in some way.
5. People have more confidence and comfort to journey to the future (the unknown) when they carry forward parts of the past (the known).
6. *If we carry part of the past forward, they should be what is best about the past*
7. It is important to value differences
- 8. The language we use creates our reality.**

*Reality is made up of many things. Perception is just one of them and with perception it is important to remember that there are many different perceptions among even very homogeneous classes of people; thus many different realities to be considered.*

- IX.** Appreciative Inquiry – shift in facilitation from focus on problem to focus on positive. *When you start with a negative question you dig a hole. And then you have to climb out. When you ask the positive question you build a mound from which you can launch.*

## **X. Brainstorming Exercise**

The questions:

- What are the one to three things about the program redesign that if we did them skillfully, everything else we try to do will have a better chance of success?
- What 3 wishes would you make for a healthy and vital structure of the program?
- What 3 wishes do you have for the redesigned program? (Another way to ask what will success look like?)

### **(Stronger) Management – 19 dots**

- a. Management (has a) commitment to and supports ... staff – (and has) respect for our expertise, respect for our concerns, for public and environment and applicant. (We have) ... interpersonal training skills ... (for) mgmt. – 12 dots
- b. (We will) ... have managers that know how to handle money and resources – 10 dots
- c. (We will have) . . . a sense of urgency that mgmt must have staff buy-in otherwise any structure will fail – 8 dots
- d. (there is a) Management style that adapts, (has) openness, sincerity, trustworthiness, believability – 7 dots
- e. With limited resources now available, (management will) provide us with, as much as possible, a distinct list of activities we will no longer be doing and what we will continue to do – 2 dots
- f. (We will have) Good decisions by managers – 1 dot
- g. Mandate time for supervisors to supervise employees – 0 dots
- h. (We will have a) Clear program direction expressed as a map of activities correlated with staff time and ability , timeline, and expected outcomes – 0 dots

### **Accountability – 14 dots**

- a. (We will) focus on core elements of work – solid, hazardous, recycling, etc. rather than going off in many directions of extra initiative and special projects – 15 dots
- b. (We will) Put professionalism back into our core values – 14 dots
- c. (We are) seeing the needs/welfare of the public and environment (our 'silent' customer) 12 dots
- d. (We will have) clear consistent regulations and application of those – 10 dots
- e. (We will) write streamlining activities into performance measures for existing teams – 5 dots
- f. (We will) use staff time and money wisely for redesign process – 4 dots
- g. (We will have) Productivity, efficiency, accountability – 3 dots

- h. (We will be able) to have consistent work products and decisions from regions and central office – 2 dots
- i. (We will )mandate and implement laws that govern this program – 2 votes
- j. (We will) structure program so that there is accountability – staff ... (is) ... held responsible for success (current structure seems to allow for us to have ability to 'pass the buck' regarding accountability) someone else's fault – 2 dots
- k. (We will) be able to meet established deadlines/objectives – 1 dot
- l. (We will) track and measure useful information related to core work elements so that project decisions can be based on accurate data – 1 dot

#### **Structure – 14 dots**

- a. (We will) develop a consistent structured approach for complaint investigation (statewide) things are getting bogged down now – 12 dots
- b. (We will) provide a sense of urgency that management must have staff buy-in, otherwise any structure will fail – dots
- c. (We will have) the ability to recognize the need to change/adjust before being forced to by outside pressures – 8 dots
- d. (We will have a) plan review coordinator of statewide plan review decisions – coordinator would review and have power to alter a decision and all decisions would be reviewed by coordinator, coordinator would have t be a PG&PE – 7 dots
- e. (We will) restructure to have technical staff supervised by technical managers to ensure consistent decisions – 6 dots
- f. Redesign ...(will) result in a bottom-up rather than a top-down program management system – 6 dots
- g. (We will) dissolve all teams and central office sections and reconstitute them into work units that cut across geographic boundaries that have 'specific; functions, responsibilities, and the ability to make decisions – 5 dots
- h. (We will) go back to a structure where direction comes from 'bottom up' staff to management in a reasonable balance – 4 dots
- i. Staff (will be) assigned to a specific task/area based on program needs. Ex.: define program priorities and assign staff (or reduce staff) based on that – 3 dots
- j. (We will) match the high priority program outcomes with the skills and aptitudes of all program people without regards for regional boundaries (focus on positive results not territory) – 2 dots
- k. (We will) structure re-org in central office (with staff input) 2 dots
- l. (We will have) ... a more data-driven than an anecdotally-driven management system – 1 dot

### **Environmental Protection – 10 dots**

- a. (We will) emphasize environmental protection over deregulation – 20 dots
- b. (Everyone will) understand WA is a regulatory programs – 14 dots
- c. Decisions (will be) made from an environmental standpoint rather than political or financial – 8 dots
- d. (We will) keep in mind what is 'good' for citizens and environment of the state (not necessary a business) – 9 dots
- e. ... the focus of program (will) be protecting the environment more than pleasing those we regulate – 5 dots
- f. We are a regulatory organization. We (will) ... resist political pressures that interfere with environmental protection – 4 votes
- g. Regulatory authority is not altered adversely (to) impact the environment – 2 dots
- h. (we have) a structure that allow staff to make decisions and focus programmatic effort based on environmental protection not funding source or external pressure – 2 dots
- i. Management elicits public/environmental input/direction into formulating environmental standards/regulation – 2 dots
- j. (We will) change funding dynamic to prevent resources needed to realize broad environmental and public health 'goods' from being in debt to politics – 0 dots

### **Leadership – 7 dots**

- a. (We will have) management that has the ability to stand up to the political pressure from the outside – 23 dots
- b. (We will have) clarify, consistency and direction of purpose avoid *fad* management styles and systems – 11 dots
- c. (We will) actually be able to identify priorities – 4 dots
- d. Management (will) ... put up a firewall against undue pressures from industry – 3 dots
- e. (We will have) strategic replacement of staff and management that are unable to improve performance this implies accountability built into the program and applied equally to all staff – 2 dots
- f. Teams and management (are) on (the) same page working towards same goals with data driven decision making – 2 dots
- g. (We will) promote a vote for a democrat – 1 dot

**Public Involvement – 7 dots**

- a. (We will have) equal input from citizens and regulated industry and business – 14 dots
- b. (We will) listen to opinions of all external customers not just to commerce and industry – 13 dots
- c. (We will) remember that the citizens of WI and the environment are our customers also – not just industry and their interest groups – 10 dots
- d. (We will) involve all the players in redesign to ensure continued environmental protection in state – 10 dots
- e. (We have) additional environmental groups to external groups – 3 dots
- f. (We will have) Input from public and environmental groups – 3 dots
- g. (We) Increase public awareness and appreciation for our program – 3 dots
- h. Supervisors who understand the work of their staff, support it, AND work with other management to coordinate program functionally (well trained management) lead, follow or get out of the way – 0 dots
- i. ... (We will be) responsive to environmental groups and public at large for benefit of environment (if necessary as private citizen join groups to promote message – 0 dots
- j. ... the public ... (is) more involved in decisions – 0 dots

**Reduce numbers – 7 dots**

- a. (We will) reduce size of management structure – 19 dots
- b. (We will) eliminate the current 15 management positions plus the program's share of all external managers air, waste leaders and other managers on CETAS and require 5 technically competent individuals who have a commitment to protect the environment above all else, to run the program and use the money saved to provide staff with better training and technical support; computers, cars, to travel, etc – 16 dots
- c. (We will) reduce (the) number of management staff – 8 dots
- d. (The) management role after redesign . (will) be more partnership with staff less hierarchical imperious – 1 dot
- e. (We will) reduce levels of management (organization is (currently) top heavy – 1 dot
- f. (We will) reduce management ... (and) improve morale ... (which) may provide for a better structure – 0 dots
- g. ... the staff to manager ratio ... (is) increased – 0 dots

### **Technical expertise – 6 dots**

- a. (We will) have supervisors in each region (who are) ... qualified to supervise tech. staff (hydros and engineers) this would require that each supervisor is a P.G. P.E. – 11 dots
- b. (We will) select managers that have program/technical expertise – 8 dots
- c. (We will) provide managers with technical expertise – 6 dots
- d. (We will have) management that really truly understands the technical aspects of what we do and an appreciation and understanding of the environmental laws that we enforce – 4 dots
- e. (We will have) less administration with more technical competent managers who really know how to manage – 3 dots
- f. Mgt. hierarchy is currently fractured, team leaders, bureau mgmt, regional mgmt with no common accountability. This is a non- –self-supporting structure. ... Staff (will) ... be accountable to one set of leadership hierarchy rather than 3. – 0 dots

### **Designate program experts – 4 dots**

- a. (We will have a) plan review coordinator that reviews decisions and supervises all technical staff (hydros and engineers) who are located throughout state – this person would need to be P.E. and P.G. – 9 dots
- b. (We will) keep ability for regions to LEAD pilot projects – 4 dots
- c. (We will) Continue decentralization – 4 dots
- d. (We will have) a hierarchical structure that does not duplicate the chain of command, pit regions against each other for money and staff allocations and provides consistent decision making process across regions and facilities – 1 dot

### **Funding – 3 dots**

- a. (We will) acquire appropriate monies to adequately fund programs and staff – 14 dots
- b. (We will) secure stable funding – 5 dots
- c. (We) secure funding sources to ensure stable program in the future – 3 votes
- d. (We will) give the regulated plenty of bones but make certain to fund other important priorities – 0 dots

### **Streamlining – 2 dots**

- a. (We will) throw out EMS in all its guises and disguises use a wooden stake so it does not come back – 21 dots
- b. (We will) get back to the basics. (There is) way too much process – 15 dots
- c. We (will) keep it practical; keep the dreams and schemes and smoke ... (screens) out of it and let all staff do their work – 5 dots

- d. (We will) simplify the approval processes that we do – 4 dots
- e. (We will) develop a streamlining team to write guidance documents – 4 dots
- f. (We will) identify problem area (i.e. problems that externals know us as having) and directly solve these. The whole program is not broken, only certain area need some change – 3 dots
- g. (We will) simplify (streamline?) how we do work – 2 dots
- h. (We will) ... not include streamlining as a priority all by itself (no number recorded)

#### **Expertise – 2 dots**

- a. (There will be) statewide experts in all waste programs – 13 dots

#### **Involvement – 1 dot**

- a. ... the people in charge (will) truly value input from staff as much as input from externals – 11 dots
- b. ... management (will) factor in the input of staff throughout the process – 1 dot
- c. (We will) listen to and use staff comments – 1 dot
- d. Management ... (will) be part of their program's work activities – 1 dot

#### **Staffing – 1 dot**

- a. (We will) reduce significantly the number of management position in the waste program – 19 d dots
- b. (We will) let the people who do the work help make the decisions (i.e. if you write a permit (you will) be involved directly with streamlining of any proposed permit process – 17 dots
- c. (We will) reduce the too-heavy structure (... with care not to displace a staff position to do this) – 8 dots
- d. (We will have) staff-to-staff interaction (we need to learn from each other) ex: case studies seeking others opinion on a technical issue – 7 votes
- e. (We will have a) training structure for new hires allows development of new experts over time – 5 dots
- f. (We will have) better use (of) existing staff expertise and interests which have been deeply eroded in prior structures – 3 dots
- g. (We will) maintain our qualified staff – 3 dots
- h. (I will) still have a job – 1 dot
- i. Staff (will take part in) choosing or voicing opinion on which 'candidates' would be managers (this should matter –trust, integrity, respect) – 0 dots
- j. (Our) management (will) abide by contractual language obligations – 0 dots

### **Communication – 1 dot**

- a. (We will have a) skilled public relations program – (we) educate public on why we do things – 12 dots
- b. (We will) keep open communications any program, level, place – 3 dots
- c. (We will have) acknowledgement by management of what worked and what did not work – 1 dot
- d. (We will) be more honest and direct – 1 dot
- e. ...the management structure that results (will be) ... more open and honest – 0 dots

### **XI. Check-out Round**

- a. Bitch session was good. Changing gears worked better than thought it would. I'm leaving more positive
- b. Putting things on the board worked – not sure the venting was necessary – still not sure why we are here – redesign structure, program, funding, etc just what is it, themes are universal
- c. Still pessimistic, not surprised by the voting. (I would) rather have management here to listen to this. If (we do) not go down inseparable paths ... (it) will lead to the destruction of the dept. Listening sessions is maybe wrong term. Interaction is what we want - engage
- d. Interesting,
- e. Encouraged to come and speak freely
- f. Not sure the right way to go about this, process should go back to square one. Positive, solidarity lots of solid themes
- g. Overall a good session, public relations vs public involvement – that is the quote to bring to management – pessimism in the room but people still care.
- h. Venting went on too long, would have liked to spend more time on the second part.
- i. Quite valuable, pulls us together, hope Bert will be able to meet with Sue and Al to adjust process and deadline.
- j. Glad I came, was not going to initially, surprised at the magnitude of discontent. Need to build on respect, get some ownership of what is happening here, help with input being valued and will amount to something – realized how nice it was 20 years ago – selling the program.
- k. Effective way to focus program - boils down to a few core concerns, (hopes)
- l. Good session, glad I came / interesting to hear all the comments / surprised at the magnitude of discontent.



- m. Happy with both parts / bitch session showed that everyone cares, and feels bad about past and potential for future going down the tubes. Liked phrasing from negative to positive questions. Don't want to be misinterpreted.
- n. Bitch went on a longer than it needed to, but people need to vent. Four hours with Bert (and) he gets what we want, but 4 years with management and they do not get what we want.
- o. Good to see colleagues / still unsure if something will come out of it. (The) process is good, change is continual.
- p. Unsure of what the focus of it was. (It was) good to see colleagues - happy to learn we can get past some things and come to resolution. (Learned the) way to phrase the question to get more positive outcome. (Looking forward to) getting copies and hope something gets resolved
- q. Encouraged by a few things. Bert may be able to phrase concerns that would have an effect on management staff. Still pessimistic (that we will) have (the) political will to go forward.
- r. Process is good / looking forward to product.
- s. Merit to it. WC has two more sessions.
- t. Time spent was fine, walking away with a feeling that we produced something. Impressed that Sue has some awareness that there could be room for change.
- u. Productive with good ideas. I am interested in seeing write-up and how management handles it.
- v. Whether it was time well spent depends on what is done, time is short and (we) need to continue
- w. Bitch session was useful - hearing that everyone else had the same concerns. I hope management pays attention. (There's) not just a little bit of grouching going on in CO. The way question was phrased – It is going to happen. What do you want to see? – Negative.
- x. Reserve judgment until I see results
- y. Overwhelmed with bitch session – and then good to turn into positive themes – this is just a start, turn wishes into realizations. I hope we are asked to participate in the future to turn wishes into ideas and actions.
- z. Thanks to Bert. The morning session would not have been possible without him. It was good. It was good for morale, like the solidarity term, “there is hope.” Positive direction we can provide and see if it will be accepted
- aa. Structure of time is poorly conceived – need more time. Now (we) need time to synthesize what we came up with, - would have liked to do it as a group, not leave up to Bert's report. Management is used loosely – team leaders, supervisors, bureau leaders, section chiefs – the hierarchy does not support itself. Their accountability does not go upwards to one functional

- unit. (There are) three different heads that do not come together anywhere / ... something will happen. How it happens (is a question) - goes to different heads that do not play together
- bb. (We could use) more time to add flesh to the ideas we came up with. More ideas and suggestions for the people doing the work – employee owned concept
  - cc. Bitch session good but a little long. (It helped us) release baggage. (We) came into the program because we care about the environment, politically driven, funding driven, but not the public/enviro – afternoon session good / too short. Preemptive redesign is good in theory but might be like weapons of mass destruction. Take the time to do it right now or (we will be) back again in 5-6 years. Can we see management input? (If so,) then (we) need to take staff and management (material) and put (them) together and bring everyone back to work on common solution.
  - dd. Momentary blip of morale, end result will be the same